

Ask Safely: Privacy-Aware LLM Query Generation for Knowledge Graphs

Mauro Dalle Lucca Tosi

mauro.dalle-lucca-tosi@list.lu

Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology (LIST)
Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg

Jordi Cabot

jordi.cabot@list.lu

Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology (LIST)
University of Luxembourg (UNILU)
Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly used to query knowledge graphs (KGs) due to their strong semantic understanding and extrapolation capabilities compared to traditional approaches. However, these methods cannot be applied when the KG contains sensitive data and the user lacks the resources to deploy a local generative LLM. To address this issue, we propose a privacy-aware query generation approach for KGs. Our method identifies sensitive information in the graph based on its structure and omits such values before requesting the LLM to translate natural language questions into Cypher queries. Experimental results show that our approach preserves the quality of the generated queries while preventing sensitive data from being transmitted to third-party services.

CCS Concepts

• **Information systems** → **Question answering**; • **Computing methodologies** → *Natural language processing*; • **Security and privacy** → **Domain-specific security and privacy architectures**.

Keywords

Question Answer, Privacy, Sensitive Data, Knowledge Graph, Q&A, Large Language Models, LLM, CYPHER

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly used to retrieve knowledge. However, their outputs may be inaccurate or even hallucinated. To mitigate this, many applications rely on Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), especially when retrieving knowledge from documents. While RAG can also be applied to knowledge graphs (KGs), this requires sending graph data to the LLM [12].

This poses challenges when users want to query KGs but lack the resources to deploy their own generative models, and when the question, the KG, or both involve sensitive data. Such situations are common in practice, for example in healthcare [19], biomedical [18], or legal [14] use cases, where privacy is critical. In these cases, existing approaches that transmit graph data to external LLMs are not satisfactory.

Before the advent of generative LLMs, several rule-based [20] and classical Machine Learning (ML) [3, 7] methods were developed to query KGs locally, without exposing data to third parties. These systems typically translated natural language questions into formal query languages. However, they were usually supervised and thus inherited well-known limitations: (1) the need for large training

datasets, which are often unavailable; (2) poor generalization to questions that differ slightly from the training set; and (3) high adaptation costs for new use cases.

Motivated by these challenges, this paper investigates a privacy-preserving approach that leverages the semantic capabilities of LLMs without disclosing sensitive information. Given a property graph as input and without requiring additional training data, our method automatically: (1) extracts the graph structure (node labels, node properties, relation labels, and relation types); (2) builds a dictionary of sensitive values from node and relation properties (which can be manually refined by users); and (3) trains a Named Entity Recognition (NER) system to recognize the identified labels, properties, and values.

Natural language questions provided by the user are then reformulated to improve clarity with respect to the graph schema, while sensitive values are masked. The LLM receives this reformulated question and is asked to generate the corresponding Cypher [10] query based solely on the graph schema passed as context. Finally, placeholders in the generated query are replaced with the original sensitive values. An additional benefit of passing only the graph schema is that it significantly reduces the number of tokens needed, which both lowers cost and improves efficiency. Moreover, the schema can be restricted to the Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) [9] sub-structure authorized for the user, ensuring that generated queries never target parts of the graph beyond user's access rights. The resulting query can be returned to the user or executed on the graph, with the results made available accordingly.

To evaluate this privacy-aware query generation approach, we conduct an ablation study examining: (1) the effect of improving question clarity through schema information; and (2) the impact of masking sensitive data before query generation. We further discuss how our approach compares with the state-of-the-art, exemplifying its effectiveness in the context of knowledge graph query generation.

2 Related Works

We divide KG-based question answering (Q&A) methods into four categories: (1) rule-based; (2) classical machine learning (ML); (3) transformer-based; and (4) LLM-based.

Rule-based methods rely on predefined rules to map natural language questions to KG query languages such as SPARQL and Cypher. They are deterministic and do not involve machine learning algorithms. For example, [20] proposes a chatbot for querying academic data, where user intent is recognized through predefined rules and managed by a finite-state system. Such methods do not require training data and provide interpretable outputs. However,

they are strictly limited to the rules defined in advance, which constrains their applicability in practice.

Classical ML methods also rely on predefined rules but incorporate machine learning algorithms such as SVM [3], XGBoost, and Maximum Entropy Markov Models [7]. These approaches learn mappings from natural language to SPARQL or Cypher using training examples. While they outperform rule-based methods, they require the acquisition and preparation of training data, which introduces additional costs.

Transformer-based methods leverage the transformer architecture [25] to improve contextualization and generalization. Those methods – such as [2], [21], and [23] – typically rely on BERT variants fine-tuned on examples of expected user queries. This line of work has substantially improved the accuracy of KG Q&A and continues to achieve state-of-the-art results [22]. However, existing approaches are usually developed for specific knowledge graphs, which limits their transferability. Applying them to new domains requires significant effort to design specialized solutions and to collect and clean large datasets of training queries.

LLM-based methods rely on generative large language models such as GPT [1], LLaMA [8], and DeepSeek [15]. These approaches achieve excellent performance [22] thanks to their generalization and contextualization capabilities, often without requiring training data. In fact, their strongest results are obtained via zero-shot prompting [27]. However, LLMs are prone to hallucinations, which must be carefully mitigated. Moreover, due to their large number of parameters, hosting state-of-the-art LLMs locally is impractical for most users. Consequently, applications typically rely on third-party services provided by companies such as OpenAI, Google, or DeepSeek AI.

In scenarios where labeled training data is scarce or nonexistent and where sensitive data is involved, users are left with two imperfect options: rule-based systems or classical ML methods that require less training data. Yet, as noted above, both categories have limited semantic ability to interpret user questions, since anything not explicitly covered by predefined rules or training examples often produces suboptimal results. Therefore, developing an approach that enables effective Q&A over KGs while addressing the privacy concerns of relying on third-party generative LLMs remains an open research problem. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of existing KG-based Q&A methods and highlights how our proposed privacy-aware LLM approach compares.

KG-based Q&A	No additional training/data	Generalization	Privacy
Rule-based	X		X
Classical ML		X	X
Transformers-based		X	X
LLM-based	X	X	
Privacy-aware LLM (our method)	X	X	X

Table 1: Comparison of KG-based Q&A methods, with “X” marking characteristics those methods have.

3 Privacy-Aware Q&A

In this paper, we investigate how to leverage the contextualization and generalization capabilities of LLMs to automatically query sensitive data from KGs using natural language questions, which may themselves contain sensitive information. Our approach enables users to rely on third-party generative LLM services without sharing sensitive data – critical in scenarios constrained by organizational policies, ethical standards, non-disclosure agreements, or legal frameworks. Throughout this paper, we illustrate our method using the METAQA dataset [26], which, although it does not contain sensitive data, is treated as if all values in the KG were sensitive.

When generating KG queries from natural language questions using LLMs, there are two main sources of potential sensitive data leakage. First, the contextual information provided to the LLM, which often includes the data from the KG itself [4–6, 16, 24]. Second, the user’s question may contain sensitive information in its text; for example “Other than Bad Boys, which movies did Will Smith and Martin Lawrence co-star in?” implies prior collaboration between the actors, which could be considered private information.

Below, we describe how our method addresses each of these challenges.

3.1 Graph structure as context

Our method relies on the observation that KGs used for Q&A tasks are typically based on an ontology or predefined structure. This structure encodes the core logic of the KG without including sensitive values. Figure 1 illustrates this concept.




Figure 1: “The Godfather” sub-KG and its structure.

Figure 1a shows a KG containing seven nodes connected to the movie “The Godfather”. This graph is constructed based on the structure in Figure 1b, which includes six node types: “Movie”, “Writer”, “Director”, “Genre”, “Language”, and “Actor”. The structure dictates node types, their attributes, and relationships. While the data stored in the KG may be sensitive, the structure itself is not, and can therefore provide sufficient context for the LLM to generate executable queries without accessing sensitive values. In addition to preserving privacy, providing only the graph structure substantially reduces the prompt size. This improves token efficiency, which directly translates into lower costs and faster query generation.

Moreover, because the schema can be restricted to the sub-structure that the user is authorized to access, the LLM is prevented

from generating queries that target parts of the KG beyond their access rights. This integrates access control directly into the query-generation pipeline, ensuring that privacy is preserved not only at the level of sensitive values, but also at the level of graph topology.

3.2 Masking user questions

User questions may contain sensitive information and domain-specific vocabulary that is difficult for the LLM to interpret when the context given omits private information. To address this, we identify two sets of entities: (i) sensitive entities that must not be sent directly to the LLM, and (ii) key entities critical for query generation, representing node labels, relations, and attributes.

For example, consider the question below, which have sensitive data explicitly flagged between brackets.

- **Sensitive question:** Which film [Will Smith] and Martin Lawrence co-acted?

Based on the graph structure from Figure 1b, one can identify six types of entities: `NODE_LABEL` (all node types in the KG), `NODE_PROPERTY` (node properties), `RELATION_LABEL` (all relation types in the KG), `RELATION_PROPERTY` (relation properties), `NODE_VALUES` (sensitive values in the KG), and `AD_HOC` (user-specified sensitive values). These entities are then masked:

- **Pre-processed question:** Which `NODE_LABEL` `AD_HOC` and `NODE_VALUE` co-`NODE_PROPERTY`?

Next, key entities are substituted with their canonical KG synonyms to reduce the risk of the LLM using incorrect terminology. For instance, “film” is replaced by “MOVIE” and “acted” by “STARRED”, matching the KG labels and properties. The resulting privacy-aware question submitted to the LLM is:

- **Privacy-aware question:** Which `MOVIE` `AD_HOC` and `NODE_VALUE` co-`STARRED`?

Key and sensitive entities can be identified using a NER algorithm appropriate to the user’s domain. In this paper, we use a simple case-insensitive one-to-one match between question tokens and KG entities or their manually defined synonyms.

3.3 Privacy-aware LLM prompt and reply

Once the KG context and user question are free from sensitive information, we construct a zero-shot prompt instructing the LLM to generate a Cypher query to retrieve the requested information. Because the prompt includes only schema-level information rather than the entire graph, it remains compact and token-efficient, allowing us to scale to larger KGs without overwhelming the LLM input. As an example, the LLM’s response to the privacy-aware question described in Section 3.2 is shown below:

- **LLM reply:**

```
MATCH (m:Movie)-[r:STARRED_IN]-(a1:Actor),
(m)-[r2:STARRED_IN]-(a2:Actor)
WHERE toLower(a1.name) = toLower("AD_HOC")
AND toLower(a2.name) = toLower("NODE_LABEL")
RETURN m.name
```

Before execution, placeholders are replaced with the original sensitive values provided by the user, yielding the final query:

- **Final Cypher query:**

```
MATCH (m:Movie)-[r:STARRED_IN]-(a1:Actor),
(m)-[r2:STARRED_IN]-(a2:Actor)
WHERE toLower(a1.name) = toLower("Will Smith")
AND toLower(a2.name) = toLower("Martin Lawrence")
RETURN m.name
```

Finally, the Cypher query is executed, and the results returned.

4 Experiments & Results

To implement the privacy-aware strategy for querying KGs described in Section 3, we used the BESSER Agentic Framework (BAF) [11]. BAF is designed to facilitate and accelerate the development of AI agents in a low-code manner. It natively implements the simple NER method described previously and allows the definition of synonyms, which are automatically used to identify key entities. Additionally, BAF integrates generative-LLM APIs, enabling seamless use of LLMs during agent execution. All the code used in our experiments is available on GitHub¹.

We evaluate our strategy using the METAQA dataset [26], which contains facts for 16,427 movies, including their actors, directors, writers, release years, language, tags, genre, IMDB votes, and IMDB ratings. The dataset also provides natural language questions and corresponding answers, with entities already annotated between brackets. We use the “vanilla” test set, containing 39,093 questions. Most of these questions follow the same pattern, varying only in entity values (e.g., actor or movie names). Because these values are automatically replaced in our privacy-aware strategy, we reduced the dataset to 503 questions with unique patterns.

First, we created a property graph in Neo4J [13] using the triples from METAQA. The graph follows the structure illustrated in Figure 1b. Each node has a “name” property, and “Movie” nodes also include properties corresponding to their connected entities and movie-specific attributes: “release year”, “tags”, “IMDB votes”, and “IMDB ratings”.

Next, we extract from the graph and provide to BAF the node types, relations, properties, property values, and their synonyms. For illustration, we manually defined a few synonyms, shown in Table 2. In practice, most synonyms in this domain can be easily resolved by the LLM.

Entity	Synonyms
Movie	film, movie, films, movies
directed_by	directed
in_language	language
release_year	year, release, released
has_tags	tags, tag, described, about
written_by	wrote, written
starred_actors	actor, actress, actors, actresses, star, starred
has_imdb_votes	votes, vote
has_genre	genre, type
has_imdb_rating	rating
name	names

Table 2: List of synonyms defined in BAF.

¹<https://github.com/maurodl/PrivateNL2CYPHER>

We then define which entities are sensitive. For this experiment, all property values in the KG are considered sensitive, except for single-word movie titles and movie tags. Terms like “Creator”, “Fall”, and “Primary” (movie titles) or “main” and “script” (tags) are not considered sensitive, as they are unlikely to reveal private information and are more likely to appear as common words in contexts unrelated to movies or tags.

Finally, we executed our agent on the 503 questions and compared the generated query results with the dataset answers. Table 3 reports the accuracy of several configurations: GPT-5 with no privacy constraints; our strategy without synonym substitution; our complete strategy; and our complete strategy after manually reviewing discrepancies.

Method	Accuracy
GPT-5 (no privacy)	83.1
Privacy-aware (no synonym substitution)	80.7
Privacy-aware (complete)	82.5
Privacy-aware (manually assessed)	91.0

Table 3: Accuracy of GPT-5 with and without the proposed privacy-aware methodology.

5 Discussion

In this section, we discuss the key insights gained from the experiments described in Section 4.

- **Privacy-awareness has minimal impact on performance.** Despite masking input questions – thus reducing semantic information available to the LLM – the effect on accuracy is negligible. Querying GPT-5 without masking yielded 83.1% correct results, while our privacy-aware method achieved 82.5% (cf. Table 3).
- **Privacy and efficiency are not trade-offs.** By transmitting only the graph structure, our approach not only protect sensitive information but also keeps the prompt compact. In our experiments, each LLM request required fewer than 1,400 tokens. This proves that privacy and efficiency are not trade-offs but complementary goals.
- **Importance of synonym substitution.** Replacing synonyms listed in Table 2 with their corresponding key entities improved accuracy from 80.7% to 82.5% (cf. Table 3). Most of this gain came from replacing the word “about” with “has_tags.” While this substitution may sound unnatural in natural language, it matched the way the dataset was structured (e.g., mapping “what topics is [Free Willy] about” to movie tags). This illustrates the value of allowing user-defined synonyms, which often capture the specific phrasing needed in a given domain.
- **LLMs sometimes outperform the dataset.** When manually reviewing the errors’ flagged in our evaluation, we found that many of them were in fact valid answers. By marking those as correct, we increased our accuracy from 82.5% to 91% (cf. Table 3). For instance, when asked “what words describe [Holiday Inn]”, the dataset expected solely

movie tags, while our method additionally returned “Musical”, which is factually correct since it is the movie’s genre. We also observed cases where vague questions were handled more effectively by our approach. For example, the dataset expected the answer “[franchise]” for the question “can you describe movie [The Final Destination] in a few words”, whereas our method produced “[The Final Destination (2009): Genres: Horror. Director: David R. Ellis. Writers: Eric Bress.]”. Finally, some dataset annotations were outright incomplete or misleading. An example is the question “which person wrote the movies directed by [Niki Caro]”, where the dataset excluded Niki Caro from the answer set – even though she wrote one of the movies she directed.

- **LLMs also make mistakes.** Not all errors came from the dataset. Some were genuine mistakes produced by the LLM. The most frequent issue was confusion about entity labels. For example, the question “who is listed as director of the movies starred by [Solo] actors” was misinterpreted, with the LLM treating “Solo” as the name of an actor rather than the name of a movie, leading to incorrect results. Another source of errors was returning more information than requested.
- **Supervised Methods and Generalization Challenges.** [17] report 100% accuracy on the MetaQA dataset by training a sequence-to-sequence transformer model to map natural language questions into graph paths. These paths are output as Prolog functions, which can then be executed to retrieve the correct answers. However, this approach is entirely dependent on training data and lacks generalization. Small variations in phrasing that were not seen during training consistently failed. For example, questions such as “Which movies starred [Al Pacino]?”, “Which movies had [Al Pacino] as an actor?”, “Which movies featured [Al Pacino]?”, or “Which movies have [Al Pacino]?” all produced incorrect results. After several attempts – with the query “Which movies [Al Pacino] starred in?” – the model was able to generate the correct answer. Thus, we emphasize the need to investigate the generalization capabilities of supervised methods, especially in Q&A settings where users are unlikely to phrase their questions according to a predefined structure.

6 Conclusion

We introduced a privacy-aware strategy for generating Cypher queries with third-party generative LLMs. By using the graph structure as context and masking sensitive information in user questions, our approach preserves privacy while still benefiting from the strong generalization capabilities of LLMs. Moreover, relying only on the graph structure keeps prompts compact and token-efficient, enabling scalability to larger graphs. Experiments on the MetaQA dataset showed that this strategy achieves up to 91% accuracy, demonstrating that privacy can be protected without losing query quality. In future work, we aim to extend this approach to more complex knowledge graphs and domain-specific use cases. We also plan to automatically filter and adapt the graph schema to the RBAC model provided for the users. Together, these directions

will allow us to explore how privacy-preserving and access control mechanisms can be integrated with LLM-based reasoning at scale.

Acknowledgments

This project is supported by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) PEARL program, grant agreement 16544475.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Sareh Aghaei, Elie Raad, and Anna Fensel. 2022. Question answering over knowledge graphs: A case study in tourism. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 69788–69801.
- [3] Addi Ait-Mlouk and Lili Jiang. 2020. KBot: a Knowledge graph based chatBot for natural language understanding over linked data. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 149220–149230.
- [4] Artem Alekseev, Mikhail Chaichuk, Miron Butko, Alexander Panchenko, Elena Tutubalina, and Oleg Somov. 2025. The benefits of query-based KGQA systems for complex and temporal questions in LLM era. In *International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Information Systems*. Springer, 426–441.
- [5] Tu Ao, Yanhua Yu, Yuling Wang, Yang Deng, Zirui Guo, Liang Pang, Pinghui Wang, Tat-Seng Chua, Xiao Zhang, and Zhen Cai. 2025. Lightprof: A light-weight reasoning framework for large language model on knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 23424–23432.
- [6] Caio Viktor S Avila, Marco A Casanova, and Vania MP Vidal. 2024. A framework for question answering on knowledge graphs using large language models. In *European Semantic Web Conference*. Springer, 168–172.
- [7] Yi-Hui Chen, Eric Jui-Lin Lu, and Ting-An Ou. 2021. Intelligent SPARQL query generation for natural language processing systems. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 158638–158650.
- [8] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints* (2024), arXiv:2407.
- [9] David Ferraiolo, Janet Cugini, D Richard Kuhn, et al. 1995. Role-based access control (RBAC): Features and motivations. In *Proceedings of 11th annual computer security application conference*. 241–48.
- [10] Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Linddaaker, Victor Marsault, Stefan Plantikow, Mats Rydberg, Petra Selmer, and Andrés Taylor. 2018. Cypher: An evolving query language for property graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2018 international conference on management of data*. 1433–1445.
- [11] Marcos Gomez-Vazquez, Aaron Conrardy, and Jordi Cabot. 2025. *BESSER Agentic Framework (BAF)*. <https://github.com/BESSER-PEARL/BESSER-Agentic-Framework>
- [12] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2025. A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models: Principles, Taxonomy, Challenges, and Open Questions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 43, 2, Article 42 (Jan. 2025), 55 pages. doi:10.1145/3703155
- [13] Neo4j Inc. 2025. *Neo4j*. <https://neo4j.com>
- [14] Jinqi Lai, Wensheng Gan, Jiayang Wu, Zhenlian Qi, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. Large language models in law: A survey. *AI Open* 5 (2024), 181–196. doi:10.1016/j.aiopen.2024.09.002
- [15] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Cheng-gang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437* (2024).
- [16] Jie Ma, Zhitao Gao, Qi Chai, Wangchun Sun, Pinghui Wang, Hongbin Pei, Jing Tao, Lingyun Song, Jun Liu, Chen Zhang, et al. 2025. Debate on graph: a flexible and reliable reasoning framework for large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 24768–24776.
- [17] Navid Madani and Kenneth Joseph. 2023. Answering Questions Over Knowledge Graphs Using Logic Programming Along with Language Models. In *Tiny papers@ ICLR*.
- [18] Nicholas Matsumoto, Jay Moran, Hyunjun Choi, Miguel E Hernandez, Mythreye Venkatesan, Paul Wang, and Jason H Moore. 2024. KRAGEN: a knowledge graph-enhanced RAG framework for biomedical problem solving using large language models. *Bioinformatics* 40, 6 (06 2024), btae353. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btae353
- [19] Richard May and Kerstin Denecke. 2022. Security, privacy, and healthcare-related conversational agents: a scoping review. *Informatics for Health and Social Care* 47, 2 (2022), 194–210. doi:10.1080/17538157.2021.1983578 PMID: 34617857.
- [20] Antonello Meloni, Simone Angioni, Angelo Salatino, Francesco Osborne, Diego Reforgiato Recupero, and Enrico Motta. 2023. Integrating conversational agents and knowledge graphs within the scholarly domain. *Ieee Access* 11 (2023), 22468–22489.
- [21] Trung Phan Hong and Phuc Do. 2025. A Novel Multi-hop Query Answering System Based on a Large Knowledge Graph and Distributed Computing. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing* 24, 3 (2025), 1–28.
- [22] Phillip Schneider, Manuel Klettner, Kristiina Jokinen, Elena Simperl, and Florian Matthes. 2024. Evaluating Large Language Models in Semantic Parsing for Conversational Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence*. SCITEPRESS-Science and Technology Publications.
- [23] Xiaqiang Tang, Jian Li, Nan Du, and Sihong Xie. 2025. Adapting to non-stationary environments: Multi-armed bandit enhanced retrieval-augmented generation on knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 12658–12666.
- [24] Shiyu Tian, Shuyue Xing, Xingrui Li, Yangyang Luo, Caixia Yuan, Wei Chen, Huixing Jiang, and Xiaojie Wang. 2025. A systematic exploration of knowledge graph alignment with large language models in retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 25291–25299.
- [25] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [26] Yuyu Zhang, Hanjun Dai, Zornitsa Kozareva, Alexander J. Smola, and Le Song. 2018. Variational reasoning for question answering with knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence* (New Orleans, Louisiana, USA) (AAAI’18/IAAI’18/EAAI’18). AAAI Press, Article 745, 8 pages.
- [27] Yuqi Zhu, Xiaohan Wang, Jing Chen, Shuofei Qiao, Yixin Ou, Yunzhi Yao, Shumin Deng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. Llm for knowledge graph construction and reasoning: Recent capabilities and future opportunities. *World Wide Web* 27, 5 (2024), 58.